

Modeling the Dialectic

Robert A. Herrmann

26 OCT 2008

Abstract: Models are constructed that satisfy each dialectical scheme TAS_1 , TAS_2 , TAS_3 . Significantly different finite models that satisfy TAS_1 and TAS_2 , a denumerable model that satisfies schemes TAS_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$ and an infinite hyperfinite model, with a single antithesis, that satisfies TAS_1 and TAS_2 are defined. It is shown that no finite model satisfies TAS_3 .

Mathematics Subject Classifications 03B22, 03B65.

1. Introduction.

Three dialectical schemes can be formally expressed in a first-order language with equality (Gagnon, 1980). Consider a set of predicates $T(-)$, $N(-)$, $A(-, -)$, $D(-, -)$, $P(-, -)$, $S(-, -, -)$. The three formal schemes are:

TAS_1

- E1 $\exists x[T(x)]$.
- E2 $\forall x[T(x) \rightarrow \exists! y[A(y, x)]]$.
- E3 $\forall x\forall y[A(y, x) \rightarrow \exists! z[S(z, x, y)]]$.
- R1 $\forall x\forall y[A(y, x) \rightarrow [T(x) \wedge \neg A(x, y)]]$
- R2 $\forall x\forall y\forall z[S(z, x, y) \rightarrow [T(z) \wedge [A(x, y) \vee A(y, x)] \wedge \neg[S(x, z, y) \vee S(y, x, z)]]]$.

TAS_2

- $N(z) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x\exists y[S(z, x, y) \wedge D(z, x) \wedge D(z, y)]$.
- E1 $\exists x[T(x)]$.
- E2 $\forall x[T(x) \rightarrow \exists! y[A(y, x)]]$.
- E3 $\forall x\forall y[A(y, x) \rightarrow \exists! z[S(z, x, y)]]$.
- E4 $\exists x[N(x)]$.
- E5 $\forall x[N(x) \rightarrow \exists y[N(y) \wedge y \neq x]]$.
- R1 $\forall x\forall y[A(y, x) \rightarrow [T(x) \wedge \neg A(x, y)]]$
- R2 $\forall x\forall y\forall z[S(z, x, y) \rightarrow [T(z) \wedge [A(x, y) \vee A(y, x)] \wedge \neg[S(x, z, y) \vee S(y, x, z)]]]$.

TAS_3

- $N(z) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x\exists y[S(z, x, y) \wedge D(z, x) \wedge D(z, y)]$.
- E1 $\exists x[T(x)]$.
- E2 $\forall x[T(x) \rightarrow \exists! y[A(y, x)]]$.
- E3 $\forall x\forall y[A(y, x) \rightarrow \exists! z[S(z, x, y)]]$.
- E4 $\exists x[N(x)]$.
- E5.1 $\forall x[N(x) \rightarrow \exists y[N(y) \wedge P(x, y)]]$.
- E6.1 $\forall x\exists y[P(x, y)]$.
- R1.1 $\forall x\forall y[A(y, x) \rightarrow [T(x) \wedge P(x, y)]]$.
- R2.1 $\forall x\forall y\forall z[S(z, x, y) \rightarrow [T(z) \wedge [A(x, y) \vee A(y, x)] \wedge S(z, y, x) \wedge P(x, z) \wedge P(y, z)]]]$.
- R3.1 $\forall x\forall y[P(x, y) \rightarrow \neg P(y, x)]$.
- R4.1 $\forall x\forall y\forall z[[P(x, y) \wedge P(y, z)] \rightarrow P(x, z)]$.

2. Standard Models.

For any model, the axioms require all relations to be nonempty. Let nonempty T be the set of theses and nonempty $\mathcal{A}$ be the set of antitheses. In this section, each of the designated models has domain $T \cup \mathcal{A}$. For the dialectic, $T(a)$ is interpreted ($\lceil T(a) \rceil$): a is a theses. Further, $\lceil A(b, a) \rceil$: b is the antitheses of a , $\lceil S(a, b, c) \rceil$: a is the synthesis of b and c , $\lceil D(a, b) \rceil$: a is qualitatively different than b and $\lceil P(a, b) \rceil$: represents an order for a and b . This order is often related to “time.” The defined predicate N restricted to various theses yields a thesis termed a “node point.” The axioms imply that if TAS_1 and TAS_2 have finite models, then R2 requires that each domain contain three or more elements. In what follows, the constant predicate symbol is used for the corresponding set theoretic object.

Model A

Definition 2.1. The numbers 1, 2, 3 are considered as but distinct symbols. The “=” means identical as symbols.

- (a) Let $T^A = \{1, 2, 3\} = \mathcal{A}^A$,
- (b) $A^A = \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 1)\}$, $S^A = \{(1, 3, 2), (2, 1, 3), (3, 2, 1)\}$, $D^A = \{(1, 3), (1, 2), (2, 1), (2, 3), (3, 2), (3, 1)\}$.
- (c) $N^A = \{1, 2, 3\}$ (or $\{1, 2\}$).

Theorem 2.2. *The structure $\mathcal{D}^A = \langle T^A, S^A, A^A, D^A, N^A \rangle$ is a model for TAS_1 and TAS_2 . Hence, TAS_1 and TAS_2 are, relative to models, consistent schemes.*

Proof. For E1, $1 \in T^A$. For E2, let $1 \in T^A$. Then $(x, 1) \in A^A$ if and only if $x = 3$. Let $2 \in T^A$. Then $(x, 2) \in A^A$ if and only if $x = 1$. Let $3 \in T^A$. Then $(x, 3) \in A^A$ if and only if $x = 2$. For E3, let $(1, 2) \in A^A$. Then $(x, 2, 1) \in S^A$ if and only if $x = 3$. Let $(2, 3) \in A^A$. Then $(x, 3, 2) \in S^A$ if and only if $x = 1$. Let $(3, 1) \in A^A$. Then $(x, 1, 3) \in S^A$ if and only if $x = 2$. R1 is obvious. For R2, let $(3, 2, 1) \in S^A$. Then $3 \in T^A$, $(1, 2) \in A^A$, $(2, 3, 1) \notin S^A$, $(1, 2, 3) \notin S^A$. Let $(1, 3, 2) \in S^A$. Then $1 \in T^A$, $(2, 3) \in A^A$, $(3, 1, 2) \notin S^A$, $(2, 3, 1) \notin S^A$. Let $(2, 1, 3) \in S^A$. Then $2 \in T^A$, $(3, 1) \in A^A$, $(1, 2, 3) \notin S^A$, $(3, 1, 2) \notin S$. Hence (a) (b) model TAS_1 .

For E4, $1 \in N^A$. E5 is obvious for N^A (or $\{1, 2\}$), since $1 \neq 2 \in N^A$. Hence, (a) (b) (c) model TAS_2 . ■

Model B.

Definition 2.3. The numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 are considered as but distinct symbols. The “=” means identical as symbols.

- (a) Let $T^B = \{1, 2\}$, $\mathcal{A}^B = \{3, 4\}$,
- (b) $A^B = \{(3, 1), (4, 2)\}$, $S^B = \{(2, 1, 3), (1, 2, 4)\}$, $D^B = \{(2, 1), (2, 3), (1, 2), (1, 4)\}$,
- (c) $N^B = \{1, 2\}$

Theorem 2.4. *The structure $\mathcal{D}^B = \langle T^B \cup \mathcal{A}^B, S^B, A^B, D^B, N^B \rangle$ is a model for TAS_1 and TAS_2 .*

Proof. For E1, $1 \in T^B$. For E2, let $1 \in T^B$. Then $(x, 1) \in A^B$ if and only if $x = 3$. Let $2 \in T^B$. Then $(x, 2) \in A^B$ if and only if $x = 4$. For E3, let $(3, 1) \in A^B$. Then $(x, 1, 3) \in S^B$

if and only if $x = 2$. Let $(4, 2) \in A^B$. Then $(x, 2, 4) \in S^B$ if and only if $x = 1$. R1 is obvious. For R2, let $(2, 1, 3) \in S^B$. Then $2 \in T^B$, $(3, 1) \in A^B$, $(1, 2, 3) \notin S^B$, $(3, 1, 2) \notin S^B$. Let $(1, 2, 4) \in S^B$. Then $1 \in T^B$, $(4, 2) \in A^B$, $(2, 1, 4) \notin S^B$, $(4, 2, 1) \notin S^B$. Hence (a) (b) model TAS_1 .

For E4, $1 \in N^B$. For E5, $1 \neq 2 \in N^B$. Hence, (a) (b) (c) model TAS_2 . ■

Model C

Definition 2.5. For the natural numbers $\mathbb{N}$, let $a_0 = 3$, $b_0 = 4$, $c_0 = a_0 + b_0 = 7$. By induction over $\mathbb{N}$, define

- (a) $\forall i \geq 0, a_{i+1} = c_i$,
- (b) $\forall i \geq 0, b_{i+1} = c_i + 1 (= a_{i+1} + 1)$.
- (c) $\forall i \geq 0, c_{i+1} = 2c_i + 1$.

From (c) and (b), $\forall i \geq 0, c_{i+1} = c_i + c_i + 1 = a_{i+1} + b_{i+1}$. From the initial values, this yields that (1) $\forall i \geq 0, c_i = a_i + b_i$. Further, $\forall i \geq 0, b_i = a_i + 1 > a_i$. Hence, (2) $\forall i \geq 0, a_{i+1} = c_i = a_i + b_i = a_i + a_i + 1 = 2a_i + 1$. Then (3) $\forall i \geq 0, b_{i+1} = a_{i+1} + 1 = 2a_i + 1 + 1 = 2a_i + 2$, and $c_i > a_i, c_i > b_i$.

Definition 2.6. For the theses, let $T^C = \{a_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$; for the antitheses, let $\mathcal{A}^C = \{b_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. (Then $T^C \cap \mathcal{A}^C = \emptyset$.) Each of the remaining undefined predicates is modeled by an appropriate relation.

- (1) Let $S^C = \{(c_i, a_i, b_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{(c_i, b_i, a_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$,
- (2) $A^C = \{(b_i, a_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$,
- (3) $D^C = \{(c_i, b_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{(c_i, a_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then $N^C = \{c_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} = \{a_{i+1} \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$,
- (4) $P^C = \{(x, y) \mid [x, y \in T \cup \mathcal{A}] \wedge [x < y]\}$.

Theorem 2.7. The structure $\mathcal{D}^C = \langle T^C \cup \mathcal{A}^C, T^C, S^C, A^C, D^C, N^C, P^C \rangle$ is a model for TAS_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Proof. E1, E2, E3, E4, and R1 are obvious. Note that $\forall i \geq 0, c_i > a_i, c_i > b_i$. Hence, $\neg[(x, z, y) \in S^C \vee (y, x, z) \in S^C]$ holds for $T^C \cup \mathcal{A}^C$. From this, R2 holds. For each $\forall i \geq 0$ and c_i , there exists a $c_{i+1} > c_i$ and $c_{i+1} \neq c_i$. Hence, E5 and E5.1 hold. Since $\forall i \geq 0, a_i < b_i$, R1.1 holds. Since $\forall i \geq 0, a_i < c_i, b_i < c_i$, then this and definition 2.6 part (1) imply that R2.1 holds and E6.1 holds from the definition of P^C . From the properties of the order $<$, R3.1 and R4.1 hold. ■

Theorem 2.7 implies that TAS_3 is consistent relative to the theory of natural numbers. Gagnon (1980) uses the theory of $\mathbb{N}$ and states that TAS_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$ satisfy a different denumerable model. Moreover, he states that other dialectical theories can be generated from TAS_3 by adding axioms. For a set X , the term “finite” means that either $X = \emptyset$ or for some $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1$, there exists a bijection $f: [1, n] \rightarrow X$. Gagnon does not show that TAS_1, TAS_2 have finite models. Gagnon does not mention that scheme TAS_3 has no finite model. For a nonempty set X and $1 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$, the notation $|X| = n$ signifies that there exists a bijection $f: [1, n] \rightarrow X$.

Theorem 2.8 *There does not exist a finite model that satisfies scheme TAS_3 .*

Proof. It should be well known that if a set N satisfies E4, E5.1 and binary relation P satisfies R3.1 and R4.1, then N is (ordinary) infinite. Indeed, N is nonempty by E4. Let $p \in N$ and $(1, p) \in f_3$. Then there exists $q \in N$ such that $(p, q) \in P$. Then from R3.1, $p \neq q$. Let $(2, q) \in f_3$. Then there exists $r \in N$ such that $(q, r) \in P$ and $q \neq r$. If $r = p$, then R4.1 implies that $(p, p) \in P$; a contradiction. Let $(3, r) \in f_3$. (1) For natural number $n = 3$, there exists an injection $f_3: [1, 3] \rightarrow N$ such that if $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$, $i \neq j$, then $f_3(i) \neq f_3(j)$. If $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, then $(f_3(i), f_3(j)) \in P$. Hence, $|N| \geq 3$ or N is infinite.

(2) Assume that for $n \geq 3$, there exists an injection $f_n: [1, n] \rightarrow N$ such that if $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, $i \neq j$, then $f_n(i) \neq f_n(j)$. If $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, then $(f_n(i), f_n(j)) \in P$. (3) For $n \geq 3$, consider $n+1$. Then there exists an injection $f_n: [1, n] \rightarrow N$ such that if $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, $i \neq j$, then $f_n(i) \neq f_n(j)$. If $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, then $(f_n(i), f_n(j)) \in P$. Since $f_n(n) \in N$, then there exists $s \in N$ such that $(f_n(n), s) \in P$. If $s = f_n(n)$, R3.1 is contradicted. Hence, $f_n(n) \neq s$. If $s = f_n(j)$, $1 \leq j < n$, then $(s, f_n(n)) \in P$. Hence, $(s, s) \in P$; a contradiction. Let $f_{n+1} = f_n \cup \{(n+1, s)\}$. Then f_{n+1} is an injection on $[1, n+1]$ into N and it follows from (2) that if $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $1 \leq i, j \leq n+1$, $i \neq j$, then $f_{n+1}(i) \neq f_{n+1}(j)$ and if $1 \leq i < j \leq n+1$, then $(f_{n+1}(i), f_{n+1}(j)) \in P$. Consequently, by induction, for each $n \geq 3$, $|N| \geq n$ or N is infinite. If $1 \leq |N| = m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $|N| \geq m+2$; a contradiction since finite cardinalities satisfy natural number order properties. Hence, N is infinite. ■

Model D

In what follows, infinitely many finite models for TAS_1 and TAS_2 are defined and each has the special property that there is but one antithesis. Simple properties of the natural numbers are used.

Definition 2.9 Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$.

- (a) Let $T_k^D = \{i \mid (i \in \mathbb{N}) \wedge (0 \leq i \leq k)\}$, $\mathcal{A}_k^D = \{k+1\}$,
- (b) $A_k^D = \{(k+1, i) \mid (i \in \mathbb{N}) \wedge (0 \leq i \leq k)\}$, $S_k^D = S'_k \cup S''_k$, where $S'_k = \{(i+1, i, k+1) \mid (i \in \mathbb{N}) \wedge (0 \leq i \leq k-1)\}$ and $S''_k = \{(0, k, k+1)\}$, $D_k^D = \{(1, 0), (1, k+1), (2, 1), (2, k+1)\}$,
- (c) $N^D = \{1, 2\}$.

Theorem 2.10 *For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$, the structure $\mathcal{D}_k^D = \langle T_k^D \cup \mathcal{A}_k^D, T_k^D, \mathcal{A}_k^D, S_k^D, A_k^D, N^D, D_k^D \rangle$ is a model for TAS_1 and TAS_2 .*

Proof. (Although the defined $\mathcal{A}_k^D$ need not be included in $\mathcal{D}_k^D$, it is useful to list it.) For E1, $0 \in T_k^D$. For E2, let $i \in T_k^D$, $0 \leq i \leq k$. Then $(x, i) \in A_k^D$ if and only if $x = k+1$. For E3, let $i = k$, $(k+1, k) \in A_k^D$. Then $(x, k, k+1) \in S_k^D$ if and only if $x = 0$. Let $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, $(k+1, i) \in A_k^D$. Then $(x, i, k+1) \in S_k^D$ if and only if $x = i+1$. R1 holds since for $0 \leq i \leq k$, $(i, k+1) \notin A_k^D$. For R2, let $(0, k, k+1) \in S_k^D$. Then $0 \in T_k^D$, $(k+1, k) \in A_k^D$ and, since $k > 1$, $(k, 0, k+1) \notin S_k^D$, $(k+1, k, 0) \notin S_k^D$. Let $(i+1, i, k+1) \in S_k^D$, $0 \leq i \leq k-1$. Then $i+1 \in T_k^D$, $(k+1, i) \in A_k^D$ and $(i, i+1, k+1) \notin S_k^D$, $(k+1, i, i+1) \notin S_k^D$. Hence, (a) and (b) model TAS_1 .

For E4, $N^D \subset T_k^D$ and $|N^D| = 2$. Moreover, the 1 and 2 are not just distinct as natural numbers but have additional qualities. The 1 is an odd number and a multiplicative identity. The 2 is the successor, even and not an identity. ■

The fact that $\mathcal{A}$ can contain but one member does not hold for a model for TAS_3 . Consider a model for TAS_3 . Let E be the domain. Then $\emptyset \neq T \subset E$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{y \mid (\exists x \in T) \wedge ((y, x) \in A)\}$. Then $\mathcal{A} \subset E$. Suppose that $B \subset \mathcal{A}$ and $|B| = 1$. Let $b \in B$. Then there exists an $x \in T$ such that $(b, x) \in A$. By R1.1, $(x, b) \in P$ and by R3.1 $x \neq b$. By E3, there exists a $z \in T$ such that $(z, x, b) \in S$. Since R2.1 holds for S , then $(x, z), (b, z) \in P$. Hence, $z \neq b, z \neq x$ by R3.1. There exists a $c \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $(c, z) \in A, c \neq z$. If $c \in B$, then $c = b$ and $(z, b) \in P$ by R1.1. By R4.1 $(b, b) \in P$. This contradicts R3.1. Hence, $|\mathcal{A}| \geq 2$ or is infinite.

For any model for TAS_3 , the domain for the binary relation P^C needs to be specified in order to apply E5.1. From E5.1, $P^C \cap N^C \times N^C \neq \emptyset$. From E2 and R1.1, $P^C \cap T^C \times \mathcal{A}^C \neq \emptyset$. Define $\mathcal{A}(x) = \exists y[y \in T \wedge A(x, y)]$. Obviously, if the axiom $\forall x[\mathcal{A}(x) \rightarrow \exists y[\mathcal{A}(y) \wedge P(x, y)]]$ is added to TAS_3 , then $P^C \cap \mathcal{A}^C \times \mathcal{A}^C \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{A}^C$ is infinite.

3. Hyperfinite Models.

Let $^*\mathcal{M} = \langle ^*X, \in, = \rangle$ be a Robinson-styled nonstandard model for all bounded set theoretic first-order statements that hold in $\langle X, \in, = \rangle$, where X is a superstructure with atoms A and $\mathbb{N} \subset A$ (Herrmann, 1991, 1993). The following result describes a special collection of ultradialectics.

Theorem 3.1 *Each infinite natural number λ generates an infinite hyperfinite structure $\mathcal{D}_\lambda^H = \langle T_\lambda^H \cup \mathcal{A}_\lambda^H, T_\lambda^H, \mathcal{A}_\lambda^H = \{\lambda + 1\}, ^*N^H, S_\lambda^H, A_\lambda^H, D_\lambda^H \rangle$. Each $Y \in \{T_\lambda^H \cup \mathcal{A}_\lambda^H, T_\lambda^H, \mathcal{A}_\lambda^H, ^*N^H, S_\lambda^H, A_\lambda^H, D_\lambda^H\}$ is an internal member of $^*X$, and $\mathcal{D}_\lambda^H$ models TAS_1 and TAS_2 .*

Proof. Simply let $\lambda \in ^*\mathbb{N} - {}^\sigma\mathbb{N}$, or $^*\mathbb{N} - \mathbb{N}$ when each $^*p \in {}^\sigma\mathbb{N}$ is identified with $p \in \mathbb{N}$. In definitions (a) (b) in 2.9, replace k with λ . Since the natural number properties used in the proof that establishes Theorem 2.10 hold for members of $^*\mathbb{N}$ (Herrmann 1991), then all the axioms for TAS_1 and TAS_2 hold for $\mathcal{D}_\lambda^H$. Each Y is equal to a set expressed using the internal definition principle (Herrmann, 1991, p. 29). For example, $S'_\lambda = \{(z, x, y) \mid (z \in ^*\mathbb{N}) \wedge (x \in ^*\mathbb{N}) \wedge (y \in ^*\mathbb{N}) \wedge (0 \leq x \leq \lambda - 1) \wedge (z = x + 1) \wedge (y = \lambda + 1)\}$. ■

4. General Logic-Systems.

In any model for these three schemes, the S relation is the basic one that models the results of the actual “logical argument.” Consider the inverse relation $S^{-1} = \{(y, x, z) \mid (z, x, y) \in S\}$. The set $\{S^{-1}\} = RI(T \cup \mathcal{A})$ represents a set of “finitary rules of inference” for a finite logic-system defined on the language $T \cup \mathcal{A}$ (Herrmann, 2001, 2006a). For finite logic-systems, the informal algorithm used to “deduce” from the set of premises $X \subset T \cup \mathcal{A}$ is modeled after the formalizable predict-logic processes used throughout scientific discourse. These processes generate an equivalent “finite consequence operator.” Although mostly not displaying the usual forms for predicate deduction, the mental processes employed to produce a formal dialectical argument using any of these three schemes and their extensions are equivalent to those mental processes used for formal predicate deduction (Herrmann, 2001, 2006b). The S^{-1} yields a theory and behavioral-signature (Herrmann, 2006b). Such predicate deduction is said to be “axiomless.” Significantly, physical first-order theories are equivalent to theories produced by axiomless first-order predicate deduction (Herrmann, 2006b).

5. Applications.

For an actual denumerable human language L , Gagnon assumes that these schemes apply to events that are both mental and physical. For some events and scheme TAS_3 , the set M of meaningful strings of symbols is a finite set. Due to Theorem 2.8, a domain E for scheme TAS_3 requires denumerably many members of L . In this case, the actual presented dialectical argument would not be applied for any members of S containing any coordinates from $E - M$. However, considering TAS_3 applied to mental activity such as mathematics, the set M can be considered as denumerable and a denumerable $E \subset M$.

The models used for TAS_1 , TAS_2 can be applied to a meaningful language M where each member of M is considered as having distinctly different meanings than any other member. If any of the schemes TAS_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, is meaningful for a denumerable E , then, using the methods in Herrmann (1993), there exists a corresponding distinct ultradialectic.

Let $f^X: (T^X \cup \mathcal{A}^X) \rightarrow M$ be any injection. Then the structure $f^X(\mathcal{D}^X) = \langle f^X[T^X] \cup f^X[\mathcal{A}^X], f^X[T^X], f^X[S^X], \dots \rangle$, where $X = A, B, C, D$, is (model-theoretic) isomorphic to $\mathcal{D}^X$. Hence, each $f^X(\mathcal{D}^X)$, $X = A, B, C, D$, models the corresponding first-order scheme TAS_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$. [Recall that notation such as $f^X[S^X] = \{(f^X(z), f^X(x), f^X(y)) \mid (z, x, y) \in S^X\}$.]

For the infinite hyperfinite model, M would need to be, at least, denumerable. This could be accomplished using systems that vary due to parameter changes. The set ${}^*M - M$ forms a higher-language and members can have significant partial meanings (Herrmann, 1993, p. 101-102). Theoretically, for any injection $f^H: [0, \lambda + 1] \rightarrow {}^*M$, the structure $f^H[\mathcal{D}_\lambda^H]$ models TAS_1 and TAS_2 .

Most certainly these models do not constitute all of specific structures that model each scheme. For example, Gagnon's model for each TAS_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$ is distinct from the ones presented here. A particular dialectical argument may require entirely different structure relations than any presented in this paper.

References

- Gagnon, L.S. 1980. *Three theories of dialectic*, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic, XXI (2):316-318.
- Herrmann, R. A. 2006a. *General logic-systems and finite consequence operators*, Logica Universalis, 1:201-208. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0512559>
- Herrmann, R. A. 2006b. The GGU-model and generation of developmental paradigms, <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0605120>
- Herrmann, R. A. 2001. *Hyperfinite and standard unifications for physical theories*, Internat. J. Math. and Math. Sci., 28(2):93-102. <http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0105012>
- Herrmann, R. A. 1993. The Theory of Ultralogics. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/9903081> <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/9903082>
- Herrmann, R. A. 1991. Nonstandard Analysis Applied to Advanced Undergraduate Mathematics - Infinitesimal Modeling. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/03122432>

Robert A. Herrmann, USNA, 43017 Davenport Sq, South Riding, VA, 20152-2050, USA
E-mail address: herrmann@serve.com